

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 8, 15 and 19 have been amended as shown on pages 7-12 of the Reply. In addition, the specification has been amended as indicated on page 2.

Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Murray and Supervisory Patent Examiner Gutierrez for the courtesies extended during the interview conducted on May 7, 2007. The merits of the claims vis-à-vis the cited reference Batty, *et al.* were discussed.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection of Claim 8

Claim 8 is objected to because of minor informalities. In view of the amendments to claim 8, this objection is now moot and should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10, 11 and 14 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10, 11 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Batty, *et al.* (US 6,223,212 B1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Batty *et al.* fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it *expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation* set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). *The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.* *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicant's claimed subject matter teaches a method of sharing computer objects between different computer spaces. To this end, independent claim 1 recites *a context association system for forming context associations between first and second objects that are stored in computer memory and are associated with each other based on user computer*

interactions, a method of sharing computer objects, comprising: storing association information relating to one or more associations between a selected object in a first computer space and one or more first objects in the first computer space, wherein the objects are at least one of files, applications, contact and communications; sharing the selected object from the first computer space with a second computer space, the second computer space including at least one of the first objects; and automatically sharing from the first computer space with the second computer space the one or more associations in the first computer space between the selected object and the at least one first object in the second computer space. Independent claim 10 recites similar features. Batty *et al.* does not disclose such claim features.

Batty *et al.* relates to techniques for coordinating the sharing of an application with multiple computer systems. At page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Batty *et al.* discloses novel features of applicant's claimed invention. Applicant's representative avers to the contrary. In accordance with the subject invention, association information relating to associations between a selected object and other objects in the first computer space is stored. The computer objects can be computer files, contacts, applications, computer communications etc. When the selected object is shared with a second computer space, associations between the shared object and other objects common to both the computer spaces are also automatically shared. At the cited portions, Batty *et al.* discloses a host computer sharing an application with multiple computer systems (shadows). To enable the shadow computer system to display an accurate representation of the output data from the application, each computer exchanges capabilities that indicate how input data to an application is to be processed and how output data from an application is to be displayed. The capabilities consist of display capabilities supported by the computer, like pixel depth, desktop size, order formats, font data and palette data and as such do not constitute association information between objects in a computer space. Hence, Batty *et al.* is silent regarding *storing association information relating to one or more associations between a selected object in a first computer space and one or more first objects in the first computer space, wherein the objects are at least one of files, applications, contacts and communications*; and also does not teach *automatically sharing from the first computer space with the second computer space the one or more associations in the first computer space between the selected object and the at least one first object in the second computer space* as recited by the subject claims.

From the foregoing, it is clear that an identical invention as recited in the subject claims is not disclosed or suggested by Batty *et al.* Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection with respect to independent claims 1, and 10 (and the claims that depend there from) should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 3 and 12 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Batty, *et al.* in view of Kenyon, *et al.* (US 6,792,430 B1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Claims 3 and 12 respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 10. As discussed *supra*, Batty *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest all features of amended independent claims 1 and 10. Kenyon *et al.* relates to organization and navigation of digital information objects of a digital information space, and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Batty *et al.* Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claims 4 and 13 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 4 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Batty, *et al.* in view of Kenyon, *et al.* as applied to claims 3 and 12 above, and further in view of Hatori (US 2003/0022112 A1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Claims 4 and 13 respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 10. As discussed *supra*, Batty *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest all features of amended independent claims 1 and 10. Kenyon *et al.* relates to organization and navigation of digital information objects of a digital information space, and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Batty *et al.* Hatori relates to a system for providing a user to safely use a computer in places where securities are not assured, and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Batty *et al.* Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

V. Rejection of Claims 9 and 15-21 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 9 and 15-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Batty, *et al.* in view of Hatori (US 2003/0022112 A1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Claim 9 depends from independent claim 1. As discussed *supra*, Batty *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest all features of amended independent claims 1. Hatori

relates to enhancing a security level when a computer connects to a network, and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Batty *et al.* Independent claims 15 and 19 recite similar limitations as independent claim 1, namely *storing association information relating to one or more associations between a selected object in a first computer space and a second computer space, wherein the objects are at least one of files, applications, contacts and communications*. Batty *et al.* is silent about such novel aspects and Hatori does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Batty *et al.* Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP685US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731